DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 806 FL 019 476

AUTHOR Kachru, Braj B.
TITLE Liberation Linguistics and the Quirk Concern.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 22p.; In: Tickoo, Makhan L., Ed. Languages & Standards: Issues, Attitudes, Case Studies; see FL 019 461.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Language Standardization; Policy Formation; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS *Quirk (Randolph)

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the concerns of Sir Randolph Quirk, former President of the British Academy and founder of the Survey of English Usage, regarding current paradigms used for describing various issues related to the diffusion of English in the global context. The historical context for these concerns is provided, a discussion of these concerns in terms of myths and multilingual realities is presented, and the application of Quirk's concerns to language policy is highlighted. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Chow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED347806
FL019476

LIBERATION LINGUISTICS AND THE QUIRK CONCERN

Braj B Kachru

I. Introduction

In his two recent papers, Sir Randolph Quirk, former President of the prestigious British Academy, and founder of the Survey of English Usage, has expressed several concerns about the current paradigms used for describing various issues related to the diffusion of English in the global context (see Quirk 1988 and 1989)*; he has particularly addressed the question of standard and variation.

These concerns were actually first expressed by Quirk in a somewhat different tone in 1985 at the 50th Anniversary Celebration meeting of the British Council in London (Quirk 1985).[1] I believe that the vital concerns expressed by him, though specifically addressed to the global spread of English, are not peculiar to English. In the literature we see that more or less identical concerns have been expressed with reference to other languages of wider communication: this includes languages restricted to a specific country (e.g. Hindi in India) or those which cut across national boundaries (e.g. Swahili in East Africa, Bahasa Malaysia in South East Asia, and French in Francophone countries).[2] The Quirk concerns are, then, worth considering whether one is concerned with language policy of a specific nation or with language policies and attitudes which cut across languages and cultures.

The case of English is important to language policy makers for other reasons, too. The global functions of English bring to the forefront a number of variables which, I believe, have generally eluded language policy makers. These variables are rarely mentioned in the literature on language diffusion, language shift and language maintenance.[3] I am particularly thinking of "unplanned" (or "invisible") policies as opposed to "planned" (or "visible") policies.[4] The Quirk concerns discussed here go much beyond specific issues, since Quirk has thrown his net very far and wide, covering a wide range of attitudes and issues: it is not possible to disentangle all the issues here.

In ideological terms, the main thrust of Quirk's recent paper (1989) is to express deep dissatisfaction with what he terms "liberation linguistics". In Quirk's paper, there is a presupposition that "liberation linguistics" has an underlying ideological motivation, an unarticulated philosophical and political

[*Note: These two papers constitute part I of this section - editor].

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

position. He says (1989: 21) "English was indeed the language used by men like Gandhi and Nehru in the movement to liberate India from the British raj and it is not surprizing that 'liberation linguistics' should have a very special place in relation to such countries." Quirk does not use any ideological term for his concerns; that does not, however, mean that his position cannot be related to an ideological position appropriate to his concerns. After all, it is rare that there is a position without an ideological backdrop. It seems to me that Quirk's position is not much different from what in another context has been termed "deficit linguistics". The concept "deficit linguistics" has so far primarily been used in the context of language learners with inadequate competence in using the vocabulary, grammar, and phonology of a language (e.g. Williams 1970; see also Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1986). It has also been used for "deficit" in organization of discourse and style strategies, and inadequate competence in manipulation of codes (e.g. Bernstein 1964 and later). During the past two or three decades a considerable body of literature has developed on this topic--both pro and con. A well-argued case against the deficit position, specifically with reference to Black English, is presented in Labov 1972. The Quirk concerns, of course, go beyond Black English and have global implications for research and the teaching of English.

II. THE QUIRK CONCERNS

First let me outline the major Quirk concerns: the concerns Quirk expresses are an attack on the positions which linguists (or, should I say sociolinguists?) have taken about the spread of English, its functions and its multi-norms;[5] in other words, on the recognition of pluricentricity and multi-identities of English. These concerns encompass a medley of issues, six of which I shall discuss here.

The first concern is that the recognition of a range of variation for English is a linguistic manifestation of underlying ideological positions. In Quirk's view, "liberation theology" has led to the demand "why not also a 'liberation linguistics'?" (1989: 20). Quirk believes that the result of this ideological underpinning is that ". . . the interest of varieties of English has got out of hand and has started blinding both teachers and taught to the central linguistic structure from which varieties might be seen as varying" (1989: 15).

The second is that there is a "confusion of types of linguistic variety that are freely referred to in educational, linguistic, sociolinguistic and literary critical discussion" (1989: 15; his emphasis).

The third is that the use of the term "institutionalized variety" with the non-native varieties of English is inappropriate. He says, "I am not aware of there being any institutionalized non-native varieties" (1989: 18). He provides

supporting evidence for his position from a native and non-native speaker competence test for French (Coppieters 1987). On the basis of which he concludes that there is

> . . . the need for non-native teachers to be in constant touch with the native language. And since the research suggests that *the natives have radically different internalizations*, the implications for attempting the institutionalization of non-native varieties of any language are too obvious for me to mention (1989: 19; emphasis added).

One might mention here, as an aside, that this position is diametrically opposed to Quirk's position expressed in Quirk et al. (1972: 26), and again in Quirk et al (1985: 27-28) where it is stated that in the case of English, such [institutionalized] varieties

> . . . are so widespread in a community and of such long standing that they may be thought stable and adequate enough to be institutionalized and hence to be regarded as varieties of English in their own right rather than stages on the way to a more native-like English.

The reference here is to the speech fellowships of English in South Asia, West Africa and Southeast Asia.

And now, coming back to Coppieter's test for French, Quirk comes to the conclusion that non-native teachers should be in "constant touch" with the native language. And he is concerned about the "implications for attempting the institutionalization of non-native varieties of any language" (1989: 19).

However, there are problems in accepting the conclusions. The solution of "constant touch with the native language" does not apply to the institutionalized varieties for more than one reason: first the practical reason; it simply is not possible for a teacher to be in constant touch with the native language given the number of teachers involved, the lack of resources and overwhelming non-native input; the second is a functional reason; the users of institutionalized varieties are expected to conform to the local norms and speech strategies since English is used for interaction primarily within intranational contexts. And, the last reason takes us to the psycholinguistic question of "internalization". The natives may have "radically different internalizations" about their L1 but that point is not vital for a rejection of institutionalization. In fact, the arguments for recognizing institutionalization are that such users of English have internalizations which are linked to their own multilinguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts. It is for that reason that a paradigm shift is desirable for understanding and describing the linguistic innovations and creativity in such varieties (see Kachru 1986a).

A number of these points have been raised by Paul Christophersen with reference to Quirk 1989 in his comments published in *English Today*, 23 (vol 6.3 pp. 61-63). Christophersen, however, is addressing his comments primarily to Quirk's mention of Coppieters's research on 'native' and 'non-native' speakers of French; he rightly warns us that "...we must not jump to conclusions regarding [its] possible implications." I cannot resist the temptation of presenting Christophersen's comments here. He says that Coppieters's research was

> exemplary in the way it was conducted and presented, but, as I am sure René Coppieters would be the first to admit, a great deal more work and more thinking are required before we can draw any safe conclusions. Let me mention a few points.
>
> In the first place, two groups of 20 and 21 people, respectively, can hardly be considered statistically significant in a matter that involves millions and millions of people.
>
> Secondly, and more importantly, 'native' and 'non-native' speakers are not two precisely defined categories. Even among 'natives', who might be thought to constitute a fairly homogeneous lot, one sometimes finds surprising variations, and an interesting example occurs among Coppieters's research subjects. One of four Italians was out of line with the other three in her perception of tense (Italian and French), apparently because she came from a part of Italy where there is a regional difference. Yet we are told that all the subjects were well educated, so she must have learnt standard Italian in her Italian school. In the English-speaking world, where in some quarters the very word 'standard' makes hackles rise, there are likely to be equally striking differences among the 'natives'. One wonders, too, how to classify people with L1 learnt for only the first four or five years of life and since abandoned and largely or entirely forgotten. Some Welsh people fall into this category. And does a *Schwyzertütsch* speaker who has learnt High German in school qualify as a 'native' speaker of German?
>
> 'Non-natives', being a negatively defined category, are bound to vary much more. A differently selected group of research subjects might well have produced a very different result. Coppieters's group contained the following L1 speakers: American, British, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Korean, Japanese and Farsi. They were all engaged in academic or similar work; they had lived in France for an average of seventeen years and appeared to be fully at home in French and in their French surroundings, but only six of the twenty-one had no foreign accent. With two exceptions they had all had formal training in French, but none of them had specialized in French.

I wonder about the non-native's training in French. The questionnaire that was used in testing them covered mainly such things as *imparfait/passé composé, il or ce*, and the place of the adjective before or after the noun - relatively subtle distinctions, yet all of them ones which should have formed part of their training. If they had been better trained in French, might they not have done better in the test? I tried one or two of the questions on my son, who had done A level French, and he seemed to cope fairly well. And my own formal training in French, which I received in Denmark well over fifty years ago, also seems to have equipped me quite well. I have never lived in France; nor has my son.

What I am unhappy about is a tendency to assume that there is a mysterious, semi-mystical difference between two groups of people, natives and non-natives, a difference which affects forever the way their minds work when handling the language concerned-something to do with the way their minds are 'wired', as some people would put it. This assumption is very similar to the Whorfian hypothesis in its outré form, in which we are all regarded as imprisoned within our respective languages and the thought forms that they impose upon us, with apparently no chance of escape across the language barrier. There is also, I fear, a link with ancient beliefs associating differences in language with tribal or national differences and assuming that these matters are all congenitally determined. Now a theory that implies unbridgeable mental differences should only be accepted as a last resort, if there is no other explanation available. And I believe there is an explanation; I think an escape route exists through improved language teaching and, most important of all, through improved language learning - because it must of course be realized that the learner himself will have to make a great effort if he is to rewrite his mind.

Quirk also seems to believe that institutionalization is a conscious process which is attempted with definite ends in mind - political ends not excluded. I am not so sure of that: institutionalization is a product of linguistic, cultural and sociolinguistic processes over a period of time. Attitudinally, one may not recognize these processes and their linguistic realizations, but that does not mean that they do not exist.

The fourth concern is that there is a recognition of variation within a non-native variety. He is concerned about the "disclaimer of homogeneity" and "uniform competence" (1988: 235) in such varieties of English. To Quirk, recognition of variation within a variety is thus confusing and unacceptable.[6]

The fifth is that there is a widely recognized and justified sociolinguisitic and pedagogical distinction between ESL and EFL. Quirk ignores this distinction partly because, as he says, "...I doubt its validity and frequently fail to

understand its meaning"(1988: 236). However, in Quirk 1985, he recognizes the validity of this distinction and explains the difference of this "terminological triad" succinctly: the EFL users "...live in countries requiring English for what we may broadly call 'external purposes'..." (p1); the ESL countries are those "where English is in wide-spread use for what we may broadly call 'internal' purposes as well" (p2); and the ENL countries are"...where English is a native language" (p2).[7]

And the last concern is that there is recognition of the "desirability of non-native norms"(1988: 237). To illustrate his argument, Quirk says that "Tok Pisin is displaying gross internal instability and is being rejected in favor of an external model of English by those with power and influence" (1988: 237).

These six concerns do not exhaust Quirk's list of manifestations of "liberation linguistics", however, they do capture the main arguments of his position.

In articulating his concerns, Quirk is not presenting an alternate model for describing and understanding the diffusion, functions and planning of multilingual's linguistic behavior with reference to English. However, the arguments he presents do contribute toward developing a framework for "deficit linguistics".

What precisely does Quirk's "deficit linguistics" entail? I believe that it entails the following six important assumptions:

1. Rejection of the underlying linguistic motivations for the range of variation, and suggesting that such variational models are motivated by an urge for linguistic emancipation or "liberation linguistics";

2. Rejection of the sociolinguistic, cultural, and stylistic motivations for innovations and their institutionalization;

3. Rejection of the institutionalization of language (in this case, specifically English) if used as a second language;

4. Rejection of the cline of varieties within a non-native variety;

5. Rejection of the endocentric norms for English in the Outer Circle;

6. Rejection of the distinction between the users of what I have termed "the Outer Circle" (ESL) of English (Kachru 1985), and "the Expanding Circle" (EFL). Quirk settles for a dichotomy between the native speakers vs the non-native (L2) speakers.

III. HISTORICAL CONTEXT FOR QUIRK'S CONCERN

The concerns which Quirk has articulated in his usual elegant style are of course not new. Such concerns have been expressed at various periods of time not only about English, but also about other languages: Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Hindi, and so on. In addition, the deficit models have been used both in L1 and L2 situations.

Just over two decades ago, Prator (1968), a distinguished English teacher and teacher trainer from this side of the Atlantic, took more or less an identical position as that of Quirk. However, there was a difference; in Prator's view the "heresy in TESL" was being committed by cousins on the other side of the Atlantic. It was Britain preaching "liberation linguistics" (see Kachru 1986b). There is, as Graeme Kennedy (1985: 7) says, referring to Quirk's 1985 paper, "a delicious irony" in that "Professor Quirk's paper reflects, in many respects, the position Prator advocated. . ." Kennedy continues ". . . however, since the orthodoxy has changed, it might be argued that Professor Quirk articulates a new British heresy. You simply cannot win."

Kennedy sees the question of standards as "fundamentally an attitudinal and especially an esthetic one" (p 7). Crystal commenting on the same paper (1985: 9-10), brings to the discussion another important dimension when he says, "what concerns me, however, is the way in which all discussion of standards ceases very quickly to be a linguistic discussion, and becomes instead an issue of social identity and I miss this perspective in his paper." Here Crystal has put his finger on a vital sociolinguistic point.

IV. MYTHS vs MULTILINGUAL'S REALITIES

The Quirk concerns are, of course, motivated by a venerable scholar's life-long desire for maintenance of what he considers "standards" for international English and the world's need for a functionally successful international language. And there is no disagreement that English is "... the best candidate at present on offer" (Quirk 1989: 24-25). One indeed shares this concern of Quirk's. However, it seems to me that in expressing this concern, Quirk has not only thrown out the bath water, but with it, the baby of many sociolinguistic realities. And to me, recognition of the sociolinguistic realities does not imply "... an active encouragement of the anti-standard ethos" (Quirk 1985: 3), nor does it imply "... to cock a snook at fashionably infashionable elitism by implying (or even stating) that any variety of language is 'good', as 'correct' as any other variety" (Quirk 1985: 5).

Quirk seems to perceive the spread of English primarily from the perspective of monolingual societies, and from uncomplicated language policy contexts. The concerns he expresses are far from the realities of multilingual societies, and negate the linguistic, sociolinguistic, educational and pragmatic realities of such societies. I shall briefly discuss some of these realities here.

1. Linguistic realities. The linguistic realities provide a complex network of various types of convergence: these are more powerful in moulding linguistic behavior than are outsiders' attitudes towards such modulated linguistic behavior (cf. Hock 1986: 498-512; Lehiste 1988). The basic criteria for marking pragmatic success is in terms of functional effectiveness with other members of the interactional network. This is particularly true of languages of wider communication or contact languages (e.g. the bazaar varieties).

2. Sociolinguistic realities. Sociolinguistic realities bring us closer to the functional context of language, attitudes, and identities. In Quirk's denial model, the sociolinguistic realities have no place. In institutionalized non-native varieties of English (and I know Quirk now rejects this concept) this context is particularly relevant as has already been demonstrated in a number of studies (e.g. see Kachru 1986b for references).

3. Educational realities. The educational realities open up a can of worms with a multitude of problems: classroom resources, equipment, teacher training, teaching materials and so on.

An additional point to be considered here is the input which a learner of English receives in acquiring the language. The input for acquisition, the model to be followed and the speech strategies to be used are provided by the peer group, the teachers and the media. And, there is an additional attitudinal aspect to it: the expectation of the interlocutors in an interactional context.

The recognition of institutionalization of a language in language policies is only partly an attitudinal matter. To a large extent it is a matter of the recognition of the linguistic processes, history and acculturation of the language in a region, and functional allocation of a variety. All these aspects must be viewed in their totality. When the Indian Constitution considers English as an "associate" official language, there is a message in it. When Chinua Achebe considers English as part of Africa's linguistic repertoire, this statement is indicative of a social, cultural, and linguistic reality. The claim that Indian English should be considered an Indian language (cf. Kachru 1989) on its functional basis is a recognition of several sociolinguistic realities. These realities must be taken into consideration while discussing the language policies in these countries.

Chinua Achebe's perspective, or Raja Rao's positive identity with English are, of course, valuable from one perspective. However, equally valuable, if not more so, is the position of those Africans and Asians who are denigrating English, foreseeing its doom. To them, its immense functional power, its social prestige, and its 'spell' on the people is suspect. Ngugi (1981: 5) is concerned that "African countries, as colonies and even today as neo-colonies, came to be defined and to define themselves in terms of the languages of Europe: English-speaking, French-speaking or Portuguese-speaking African countries." To him the "biggest weapon" is "the cultural bomb", and

> the effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. . . It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other peoples' languages, rather than their own (1981: 3).

Then, there is the voice of Pattanayak (1985: 400) from another continent who says that

> English language in India has fostered western orientation and reduced the self-confidence of its users. Its dominant use in education has created a system which has bypassed the majority; in administration it has denied the majority participation in the socioeconomic reconstruction of the country and has made justice unjusticiable [sic]. Its use in the mass media threatens to homogenize cultures, obliterate languages and reduce people into a mass.

The recognition of realities of multilingual societies means relating policies concerning world Englishes to the complex matrix of identities and uses. Let me briefly outline here what I have said about this point in an earlier paper (Kachru 1987). The institutionalization and continuously expanding functions of English in the Outer Circle depend on several factors which demand demythologizing the traditional English canon. The "invisible" and not often articulated factors are, for example: (a) the Outer Circle users' emotional attachment to English. The result is that the our code vs their code dichotomy, as suggested by Quirk, becomes very blurred. This attachment is evident in response to questions asked to creative writers in English who write exclusively in English or in English and their "mother tongues" [8]; (b) the function of English as part of code extension in the verbal repertoire of a multilingual. It is not only a question of code alternation in the sense of switching between codes but also in "mixing" of codes (e.g. English and Indian languages); (c) recognition of English as a nativized and

acculturated code which has acquired local non-Judeo-Christian identities; and (d) recognition of English as a contact code for intranational function, the international functions being marginal.

V. WORLD ENGLISHES AND LANGUAGE POLICIES

What lessons does the spread of English have for our understanding of approaches to language policies and their formulation? There are several lessons which help us in sharpening our conceptualization and formulation of language policies.

1. Pressure groups and change. The first is the close relationship between the various pressure groups and their influence on changes in the policies. The parameters of language policies are only partially in the hands of the planners. The spread of English during the post-colonial period provides several case studies: India, Malaysia, Indonesia, Bangladesh.

In all these countries the recommendations of the planners had to be changed to meet the real political demands or to project an ideological image (e.g. that of Islamization in Bangladesh, and the calming of Muslim fundamentalist groups in Malaysia).

2. Unplanned parameters. The second is the power of unplanned language planning, as opposed to that of planned (visible) language planning. Visible language planning refers to the organized efforts to formulate language policies by recognized agencies. On the other hand, unplanned language "planning" is the efforts of generally unorganized, non-governmental agencies for acquiring and using a language. This point is well illustrated in Pakir (1988) and Y Kachru (1989). In fact, the invisible language policies are often contrary to the policies espoused by the state or other organized agencies. And such invisible pulls seem to be more powerful than the visible ones. Who are the initiators of invisible language policies? The studies on, for example, Singapore and Malaysia show that invisible language planning is determined to an extent by the attitude of parents toward a language, the role of the media, the role of the peers, and the societal pressures. What we notice, then, is the conflict between the slogan concerning the language policies and the action in actual execution of the policies; there is abundant cross-cultural evidence to support this point (see Kachru 1986b).

The other dimension of invisible language policies involves the role of creative writers in moulding language policy. I am not aware of this aspect being seriously considered in the literature on this topic. Two examples related to the use of English come to mind: one from Southeast Asia and another from South

Asia. In Singapore the stated language policy is a non-recognition of what has been termed basilect. However, as Pakir (1988) shows, this variety plays an important role in the verbal repertoire of Singaporeans. That this variety is a viable medium for literary creativity is demonstrated in the poems of, for example, Arthur Yap, and in fiction by Catherine Lim and others (see Kachru 1987). The result is that in spite of the language policy makers' open rejection of this variety, the basilect variety continues to function as a valuable linguistic tool in the verbal repertoire of Singaporeans.

In two South Asian countries, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, it is due to the efforts of literary writers in addition to other invisible planners who keep English a candidate in their language policies. Hashmi (1989: 8) considers Pakistani literature in English "as a national literature" which is responsive "... to the society in which it is created, and to the sensitivities that the society engenders." In Sri Lanka, English came back in a somewhat 'unplanned' way since "... the monolingual Sinhalese and Tamil had ... no means of communication with members of other communities" (Wijesinha 1988: i). And in India, as in other regions of the Outer Circle, as Narasimhaiah argues (nd: 14) it was "... a different racial and national genius and different social realities" which "called for departures from the normal English syntax, different intonational contours and made it inevitable for Indian writers to assimilate them into their own speech rhythms" (see also Kachru 1986a).

Invisible strategies are used not only when it comes to an imposed colonial language, as in the case of English: the same strategies are adopted in multilingual societies as a reaction--in favor or against--other languages of wider communication. Consider India's case again: In the Hindi belt of India (madhya desa), the speakers of what were considered the dialects of Hindi are establishing the rights of their own languages. The cases in point are that of Maithili in the state of Bihar and Rajasthani in the state of Rajasthan. The main reasons for this vibrantly articulated trend are:

(a) to establish an identity within a larger speech community,

(b) to mark ingroupness to obtain and retain power in a democratic society,

(c) to establish a pressure group for economic and other advantages, and

(d) to assert cultural separateness in literary and other traditions.

In South Asia and Southeast Asia, to consider just two regions, we have cases of numerous strategies used to frustrate the organized language policies. But that is not all. There are also cases of invisible language planners frustrating the unrealistic language policies: again one thinks of Singapore or Bangladesh.

In Bangladesh, when it formed a part of Pakistan, the Pakistani policy of language imposition was repeatedly rejected and in the process several people were killed during the language riots. February 24 is annually observed as Language Martyr's day in Bangladesh. These are important cases of language and identity which result in significant human sacrifice and suffering. The question of identity with language equally applies to English, too. It is in this sense that English has multi-cultural identities.

VI. THE QUIRK CONCERN AND LANGUAGE POLICIES

One might ask in what sense are the Quirk concerns relevant to the theoretical, sociolinguistic and pragmatic issues related to language planning? The 1988 and 1989 papers of Sir Randolph Quirk are thought-provoking in more than one way. One most important contribution of the papers is that they provoke us to ask some serious questions about language policies and attitudes, which are not generally asked in the literature on the topic. Consider, for example the following four questions.

The first question is of a theoretical nature: Can language policies be formulated and implemented in a theoretical vacuum (whether one is talking of a sociolinguistic theory or that of contact linguistics.)?

The second question is related to attitudes and identities: Can attitudes and identities be separated while discussing language policies, standardization and the norm?

The third question takes us to the politics of language policies: what role, if any, is played by political leaders in imparting language policies whether visible or invisible? The visible aspect of it is illustrated by the Islamization and Arabization (e.g. Bangladesh), or Hindu fundamentalism and Sanskritization (e.g. India). The invisible aspect of it is the concern for native-like standards or about falling standards of English expressed by political leaders as mentioned by Quirk (Indira Gandhi of India and Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore).

The fourth question takes us to the age old topic in second language acquisition: what, if any, are the strategies which the influential and powerful native-speakers use to control the direction of English, its innovations, and its acculturation?

In the three papers mentioned earlier, Quirk has not answered any of these questions: that he has raised some very provocative questions is, of course, in itself a contribution to an intense debate. These questions are closely related to contact linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and literary creativity. These areas are vital for our understanding of language acquisition, use and creativity in human language.

It seems to me that any language policy divorced from "a renewal of connection" (to use a Firthian term) with these theoretical areas is not going to be insightful. One can not develop a language policy merely on attitudes. Attitudes may indeed be important exponents of an underlying motive for language policies as, for example, was the "Imperial Model" discussed by Quirk. But mere attitude cannot provide a sound base for developing a policy. In my view, Sir Randolph Quirk has presented a serious theoretical dilemma to us, by suggesting that the spread of English, and its resultant linguistic, sociolinguistic and literary consequences be seen purely from an attitudinal perspective. I believe that language history is not on his side.

It seems to me that there are several fallacies in conceptualizing world Englishes in the Outer Circle: these are primarily of four types: theoretical, methodological, linguistic and attitudinal. I have discussed these in detail in Kachru 1987 [1989].

In Quirk's arguments one notices a subtle rejection of the deviational, contextual, variationist, and interactional approaches for the understanding and description of the implications of the spread of English. While supporting the deficit approach, Quirk does not identify in any of his three papers the methods one might use in controlling codification around the world: I have discussed elsewhere (1985) four types of codification traditionally used for implementation of language policies. These are:

1. Authoritative or mandated codification. This includes policies generally adopted by the academies. A good example of this is the French Academy established in 1635. As is well-known, there were two attempts to set-up such academies for English: the first in England in 1712, and the second in the USA in 1780. And both failed. Perhaps history has a lesson for us.

2. Sociological or attitudinal codification. This is reflected in social or attitudinal preference of certain varieties. Abercrombie (1951: 14) has called it the "accent bar". However, this bar does not apply to "accent" only but is often extended to other levels too: grammatical, lexical, discoursal and stylistic.

3. Educational codification. This refers to codification determined by the dictionaries, the media, teacher's attitudes and so on.

4. Psychological codification. A good example of this is the psychological constraints put on the ritualistic use of Sanskrit. The correct use was a precondition for effective use of the language and incorrect use could result in the wrath of gods.

In the case of English there is essentially no authoritative codification, unless, of course, we grant authoritative sanction to various dictionaries and language manuals; the codification for English is primarily sociological, educational and indeed attitudinal. It seems to me that the deficit approach fails not only for the reason that it is based on several fallacies, it also fails for the reason that it is based on, at least, four false assumptions about the users and uses of English.

The first assumption is that in the Outer and Expanding circles (that is, Quirk's ESL and EFL countries), English is essentially learnt to interact with the native speakers of the language. This, of course, is only partially true. The reality is that in its localized varieties, English has become the main vehicle for interaction among its non-native users, with distinct linguistic and cultural backgrounds -- Indians interacting with Nigerians, Japanese with Sri Lankans, Germans with Singaporeans, and so on. The culture bound localized strategies of, for example, politeness, persuasion, and phatic communion transcreated in English are more effective and culturally significant than are the 'native' strategies for interaction.

The second assumption is that English is essentially learnt as a tool to understand and teach the American or British cultural values, or what is generally termed the Judeo-Christian traditions. This again is true only in a marginal sense. In culturally and linguistically pluralistic regions of the Outer Circle, English is an important tool to impart local traditions and cultural values. A large number of localized linguistic innovations and their diffusion is related to local cultural and sociopolitical contexts.

The third assumption is that the international non-native varieties of English are essentially "interlanguages" striving to achieve "native-like" character.[9] This position has been taken by, among others, Selinker (1972). In reality the situation is, as Quirk et al. observed in 1972 and again in 1985, that such institutionalized varieties are ". . . varieties of English in their own right rather than stages on the way to more native-like English." This is a sociolinguistically correct position (see Sridhar and Sridhar 1986; see also Lowenberg and Sridhar eds. 1985).

The fourth assumption is that the native speakers of English as teachers, academic administrators and material developers are seriously involved in the global teaching of English, in policy formulation, and in determining the channels for the spread of language. In reality that is again only partially true.

In proposing language policies for English in the global context, the situation is indeed complex, and there are no easy answers. There is thus a need for a "paradigm shift" as has been proposed in several recent studies. The paradigm shift entails reconsidering the traditional sacred cows of English which does not necessarily mean, as Quirk suggests (1985: 3), "the active encouragement of anti-standard ethos" The list of such sacred cows is long; I do

not propose to list all of them here. But let me mention just three theoretical constructs here which linguists and language teachers have considered sacred. I'm not sure that these are still sacred for English. I am thinking of the concepts such as the "speech community" of English, "ideal speaker-hearer" of English and the "native speaker" of English [10].

In the context of world Englishes, what we actually see is that diversification is a marker of various types of sociolinguistic "messages". Let me briefly mention some of these here from an earlier study on this topic (Kachru 1987): first, English as an exponent of distance from the Inner Circle -- it may be social, cultural, and ideological distance. Second, English as a marker of "creativity potential". This aspect is clearly evident in the innovations used in creative writing of Ahmad Ali, Mulk Raj Anand, Raja Rao, Salman Rushdie, Ngugi wa Thiongo and Amos Tutuola. Third, English as a marker of the "Caliban Syndrome". This syndrome is a linguistic response to what Ngugi (1981) has called the "cultural bomb" effect of the colonial powers. There is no doubt that the "linguistic bomb" is somewhat diffused by giving it a local identity and a new name.

The earlier diffusion of English, as Quirk rightly suggests, followed the Imperial model of language spread. However, that historical fact has changed with later sociolinguistic realities, acculturation and diversification of the language. A rejection of this reality implies codification as a means of linguistic control. And that is a very "loaded weapon". This linguistic control is exercised in three ways: by the use of channels of codification and the control of these channels; by the attitude toward linguistic innovations, and their diffusion by those who are not part of such speech fellowships; and by the suggestion of dichotomies which are sociolinguistically and pragmatically not meaningful. Let us not forget that this subtle linguistic control provides immense power to these who have the power and can define. One can not, therefore, ignore the warning of Tromel-Plotz (1981: 76) that "only the powerful can define others and can make their definitions stick. By having their definitions accepted they appropriate more power."

And making these definitions stick is not power in an abstract sense only. There is more to it in economic terms: a recent report says, "the Worldwide market for EFL training is worth a massive £6.25 billion a year according to a new report from the Economic Intelligence Unit" (EFL Gazette. March 1989). The economics of determining and proposing language policies has never been so vital before. What effect the "liberation linguistics" may have in marketing English is just being studied.

There is no doubt that current debate on the "liberation model" vs. "deficit model", particularly with reference to English, is presenting numerous theoretical and pragmatic challenges to language policy makers. We have so far tackled issues of standardization and corpus planning in local and regional terms,

except in the case of survival registers where international codification has been proposed (e.g. SEASPEAK). However, world Englishes raises questions about international standardization with new parameters: us vs them. This, in my view, is an unprecedented challenge to language policy makers. It takes us across languages and cultures, practically on every continent. The Quirk concern clearly articulates the dilemma, but, as Crystal has rightly pointed out (1985: 9-10), completely misses the perspective of "social identity"; the issues have been divorced from sociolinguistic and pragmatic contexts.

In conclusion, let me share with you a story, actually a true story, narrated to me by a former Ambassador of India to the USA. [11] The story is a touching one, about a young American scholar who spent several years in a village in the Bihar State in Eastern India. At the time of his departure for the USA, the village council (panchayat) gave him an Indian style farewell. During the ceremony, one member of the village council, in his own dialect, requested the village headman to ask the young American guest if there are water buffaloes in his country, the USA. The puzzled young American replied "No". This response completely surprised, and somewhat shocked, the villager, and he innocently remarked that if the chief guest's country has no water buffaloes, it must be a poor country! And lo and behold, before the farewell ceremony concluded, the young American scholar was presented with two healthy water buffaloes and the head of the village council was profusely apologizing for giving him just two buffaloes. But he reassured the puzzled young American with folded hands (an Indian gesture of respect) that he should rest assured: in course of time, after reaching the USA, these two healthy buffaloes would multiply and make his native America prosperous.

And thereby hangs a linguistic tale: in this well meaning story there is a message for all of us who have suggestions for determining policies about English around the world. What is actually "deficit linguistics" in one context may actually be a matter of "difference" which is based on vital sociolinguistic realities of identity, creativity and linguistic and cultural contact. The questions are: can sociolinguistic realities be negated? And, can international codification be applied to a language which has over seven hundred million users across the globe? If the answer to the second question is "yes", it is vital to have a pragmatically viable proposal for such codification. We have yet to see such a proposal.

17

NOTES

[1]Quirk and Widdowson eds. 1985 contain the main papers presented at the conference and the discussion.

[2]For Hindi see Sridhar 1988, for other languages see e.g. Coulmas ed. 1988.

[3]See e.g. Kachru 1988 and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1986.

[4]See e.g. Pakir 1988, Kachru, Y. 1989.

[5]This includes, e.g. Ayo Bamgbose, John R Firth, M A K Halliday, Larry E Smith, Peter Strevens, Edwin Thumboo. My position in this connection is presented in papers published since 1962. A number of these are in Kachru 1983, 1986b, and Kachru ed. 1982.

[6]For a detailed discussion of the functional reasons for variation see Kachru 1986b.

[7]For a sociolinguistically and pragmatically motivated discussion of this triad see Kachru 1985

[8]See, e.g. Lal 1965

[9]For questions concerning this position see studies in Sridhar and Lowenberg eds. 1985.

[10]For a detailed discussion see Kachru 1988. See also Paikeday 1985.

[11]K R Narayanan told me this story in 1983. This has also been published in his book *India and America: Essays in Understanding* (1984: Washington D C: The Information Service of the Embassy of India, p.x). Narayanan writes "I used to tell a story -- a true story -- to illustrate this peculiar mixture of goodwill and lack of understanding that characterizes our relationship [India and US]."

REFERENCES

ABERCROMBIE, David 1951. R P and Local Accent. The Listener, 6 September 1951. [Reprinted in D Abercrombie, Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics, London: Oxford University Press.]

BERNSTEIN, Basil 1964. Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences. American Anthropologist 66: 55-69.

COPPIETERS, René 1987. Competence Differences Between Native and Near-Native Speakers. Language, 63: 544-573.

COULMAS, Florian ed 1988. With Forked Tongues: What are National Languages Good For? Ann Arbor, M I: Karoma.

CRYSTAL, David 1985. Comment. In Quirk and Widdowson eds. 1985.

HASHMI A 1989. Prolegomena to the Study of Pakistani English and Pakistani Literature in English. Paper presented at the International Conference on English in South Asia, Islamabad, January 4-9, 1989.

HOCK, Hans Henrich 1986. Principles of Historical Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton de Guyter.

KACHRU, Braj B 1983. The Indianization of English: the English Language in India. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

KACHRU, Braj B 1985. Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle. In English in the World. Edited by Randolph Quirk and H G Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KACHRU, Braj B 1986a. The Bilingual Creativity: Discoursal and Stylistic Strategies in Contact Literatures in English. In Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes. Edited by Larry E Smith. London: Prentice-Hall.

KACHRU, Braj B 1986b. The Alchemy of English: the Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes. Oxford: Pergamon Press. (Reprinted 1990 University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL.)

KACHRU, Braj B 1987. The Past and Prejudice: Toward de-Mythologizing the English Canon. Linguistic Topics: Papers in Honor of M A K Halliday, edited by R Steel and T Threadgold. Amsterdam and Philadelphia J Benjamin.

KACHRU, Braj B 1988. The Spread of English and Sacred Linguistic Cows. In Lowenberg ed 1988.

KACHRU, Braj B 1989. Indian English. Seminar. July 1989.

KACHRU, Braj B ed 1982. The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

KACHRU, Yamuna 1989. Modernization of Indian Languages: English in Unplanned Corpus Planning. Paper presented at the 1989 Mid-America Linguistics Conference, University of North Iowa, October 6-7, 1989.

KENNEDY, Graeme 1985. Comment. In Quirk and Widdowson eds. 1985.

LABOV, William 1972. Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

LAL, P 1965. Modern Indian Poetry in English: an Anthology and a Credo. Calcutta: Writers Workshop.

LEHISTE, Ille 1988. Lectures on Language Contact. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

LOWENBERG, Peter ed 1988. Language Spread and Language Policy: Issues Implications and Case Studies. (GURT 1987) Washington D C: Georgetown University Press.

LOWENBERG Peter and S N Sridhar eds. 1985. World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition Research. Special Issue of World Englishes. 5.1.

NARASIMHAIAH, C D nd. Indian Writing in English: A Reply to Dom Moraes. In Indian Literature in English: Contemporary assessments, edited by C N Narasimhaiah and C N Srinath. Bangalore: Wiley Eastern (P) Ltd. (A Dhvanyaloka Publication)

NGUGI, wa Thiongo 1981. Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. London: James Currey 1981.

PAIKEDAY, T M 1985. The Native Speaker is Dead! Toronto: Paikeday Publishing.

PAKIR Ann 1988. Education and Invisible Language Planning: the Case of English in Singapore. Paper Presented at the 1988 Regional seminar on Language Planning in Multilingual Settings: The Role of English. National University of Singapore, Singapore, 6-8 September 1988.

PATTANAYAK, D P 1985. Diversity in Communication and Languages; Predicament of a Multilingual State: India, a Case Study. In Language of Inequality edited by N Wolofson and J Manes. The Hague: Mouton.

PHILLIPSON, Robert and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1986. Linguistic Rules in Education. Part 1. Denmark: Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI.

PRATOR, Clifford 1968. The British Heresy in TESL. In J A Fishman, C A Ferguson, and J D Gupta eds. Language Problems in Developing Nations. New York: John Wiley.

QUIRK, Randolph 1985. The English Language in a Global Context. In R Quirk and H G Widdowson eds. 1985. pp 1-6.

QUIRK Randolph 1988. The Question of Standards in the International Use of English. In Peter Lowenberg ed 1988. pp 229-241.

QUIRK, Randolph 1989. Language Varieties and Standard Language. JALT Journal 11.1, pp 14-25.

QUIRK, Randolph and Henry Widdowson eds. 1985. English in the World: Teaching and Learning of Language and Literatures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

QUIRK, Randolph, S Greenbaum, G Leech and J Svartvik 1972. A Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Longman.

QUIRK, Randolph, S Greenbaum, G Leech and J Svartvik 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

SELINKER, Larry 1972. Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics. 10. 209-231.

SRIDHAR, K K and S N Sridhar 1986. Bridging the Paradigm Gap: Second Language Acquisition Theory and Indigenized Varieties of English. World Englishes. 5.1. 3-14.

SRIDHAR, S N 1988 Language Variation, Attitudes, and Rivalry: The Spread of Hindi in India. In Lowenberg ed 1988.

TROMEL-Plotz, Senta 1981. Languages of Oppression. Review Article. Journal of Pragmatics. 5. 67-80.

WIJESINHA, R ed 1988. An Anthology of Contemporary Sri Lankan Poetry in English. Colombo: The British Council, Sri Lanka.

WILLIAMS F 1970. Language and Poverty. Chicago: Markham.